

Remarks

The Office Action mailed November 21, 2004 has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment and the following remarks are made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-20 are now pending in this application, of which claims 1, 4, 5, 7 and 18 have been amended. It is respectfully submitted that the pending claims define allowable subject matter.

The specification has been amended to correct clerical errors therein.

The claims have been amended for clarity, but Applicants maintain that claims 1-20 read on the elected species I in response to the previous Office Action, and also maintain that claims 1, 8 and 18 remain generic to the identified species.

The objection to the disclosure is respectfully traversed. Paragraph [0029] has been amended to avoid double use of the reference character "54" and also to remove inadvertent underlining from the fourth sentence thereof. Applicants accordingly request that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

The objection to claims 1 and 7 because of informalities is respectfully traversed. Claim 1 has been amended as suggested in the Office Action. Claim 7 has been amended in a manner different from the suggestion in the Office Action. Applicants believe that the suggested amendment to claim 7 was not consistent with the specification or Applicants intent when drafting the claim, and that the amendment submitted above better overcomes the noted informality and is in full accord with Applications intent in claim 7 and the accompanying description of the invention. Applicants accordingly request that the objection to claims 1 and 7 be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Golden (U.S. Patent No. 3,480,723) is respectfully traversed.

Golden describes a splice for conductor pairs in an end-to-end relationship. The splice includes, as illustrated in Figure 9, L shaped connector elements (30) and (31). Each of the elements (30) and (31) includes a two-wire receiving portion (17') and an L-portion (32) joined by a connecting tab (34) at a right angle to one another. The elements (30) and (31) include bent tabs (21') providing the structure of a U-shaped cross section, and each tab (21') embraces one wire of a conductive pair. Conductor pairs A and B are received in the portions (17') of the connector elements (30) and (31), and the L-portions (32) provide a branched wire receiving portion for a third conductor pair. The connector elements (30), (31) are received in insulating sleeves (16) having a diameter slightly greater than the conductive pairs to be joined.

Claim 1 recites a contact comprising "a body-defining a longitudinal dimension and a transverse dimension, said body defining a first channel configured to receive a conductor extending across said body along the longitudinal dimension," and "said body defining a second channel overlapping and crossing said first channel, said second channel configured to receive a conductor extending across said body along the transverse dimension, and at least one of a lance and a tooth extending from each of said first and second channels to secure said respective conductors thereto."

Golden neither describes nor suggests a contact having a body defining a first channel and a second channel overlapping and cross the first channel as recited in claim 1. Rather, Golden describes a splice having connector elements (30), (31) arranged in an L-shaped configuration to provide a tap connection between three wires. The L portions (32) do not cross or overlap the portions (17') of the connecting elements (30) and (31). The Golden connector elements (30) and (31) engage conductive pairs in an end-to-end relationship, and not in crossover relationship as does the present invention. The Golden reference, as a whole, neither describes nor suggest the contact of claim 1.

Claim 1 is therefore submitted to be patentable over Golden.

Claims 2-7 depend from independent claim 1, and when the recitations of claims 2-7 are considered in combination with the recitations of claim 1, claims 2-7 are likewise submitted to be patentable over Golden.

Independent claim 8 recites a contact comprising “a body having a longitudinal dimension and a transverse dimension, lances located at each opposite end of said body, said lances being spaced apart to define a first channel along said longitudinal dimension, said first channel being configured to receive a first wire across said body,” and “a plurality of teeth extending from said body, said teeth being located along said transverse dimension, said plurality of teeth spaced apart to define a second channel along said transverse dimension for receiving a second wire across said body, said second wire overlapping and crossing said first wire.”

For the reasons set forth above, Golden neither describes nor suggests a contact having first and second channels receiving respective wires across the contact, wherein the wires overlap and cross one another.

Claim 8 is therefore submitted to be patentable over Golden.

Claims 9-16 depend from independent claim 8, and when the recitations of claims 9-16 are considered in combination with the recitations of claim 8, claims 9-16 are likewise submitted to be patentable over Golden.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 102 rejection of claims 1-16 be withdrawn.

The rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Golden is respectfully traversed.

Claim 17 depends from claim 16, which is submitted to be patentable over Golden for the reasons set forth above. When the recitations of claim 17 are considered in combination with the recitations of claim 16, it is respectfully submitted that claim 17 is likewise patentable over Golden.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 rejection of claim 17 be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Golden in view of Leaf et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,074,065) is respectfully traversed.

Leaf et al. describe an insulated wire splice for connecting two insulated magnet wires (32) and (34) in a side-by-side relationship. Leaf et al. do not describe or suggest a contact having channels which overlap and cross one another and connect to wires which overlap and cross one another in the channels. Leaf et al. therefore adds nothing to the teaching of Golden with respect to the instant invention.

Claim 18 recites a contact assembly comprising "a body having a longitudinal dimension and a transverse dimension intersecting the longitudinal dimension," a carrier strip," and "a series of contacts coupled to said carrier strip, at least one contact in said series of contacts comprising: lances located at opposite ends of said body, said lances being spaced apart to define a first channel along said longitudinal dimension, said first channel being configured to receive a first wire; and a plurality of teeth extending from said body, said teeth being located along said transverse dimension, said plurality of teeth spaced apart to define a second channel along said transverse dimension for receiving a second wire, said first and second channels overlapping one another and said wires crossing one another when received therein."

Golden in view of Leaf et al. are not suggestive of the contact assembly of claim 18. Neither of the references describe or suggest a contact for joining wires crossing over one another in respective channels that overlap one another. Golden describe a splice connector for

joining wires in an end-to-end relationship while Leaf et al. describe a splice connector for joining wires in a side-by-side relationship. Collectively, the references fail to teach or suggest each of the recitations of claim 18.

Claim 18 is therefore submitted to be patentable over Golden in view of Leaf et al.

Claims 19 and 20 depend from claim 18, and when the recitations of claim 19 and 20 are considered in combination with the recitations of claim 18, it is respectfully submitted that claims 19 and 20 are likewise patentable over Golden.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 rejection of claims 18-20 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



Bruce T. Atkins
Registration No. 43,476
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070